

REMARKS

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated July 21, 2009. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

The Abstract has been amended to replace the legal phraseology.

Page 4 of the Specification has been amended to replace "1.0 to 30%" with "3 to 20%" in order to provide antecedent basis for claim terminology. This amendment does not involve new matter because it finds its basis in original Claim 11.

Claims 21-23 have been amended in view of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. As now amended these claims should be definite.

The indication of allowability of Claims 25, 26 and 29 is noted with appreciation. Each of these claims has now been placed in independent form. Upon reviewing the claims some minor inaccuracies were noted in Claims 27 and 28 with regard to the description of the corresponding subject matter in the Specification. Accordingly, Claims 27 and 28 have been amended for consistency with the Specification. In particular, support for the subject matter of Claim 27 is found at page 6, lines 30-34. Support for the subject matter of Claim 28 is found at page 7, lines 19-27. In placing Claim 29 in independent form wherein the subject matter of parent Claims 16, 27 and 28 have been incorporated into Claim 29, Claims 27 and 28 have been incorporated in the form in which they are also amended for better consistency with the Specification.

Claims 17-23 and 27-28 remain in the application as being dependent directly or indirectly on Claim 16 which now includes the features of allowable Claim 25. A corresponding set of dependent claims has been added to independent Claim 26 and claims corresponding to Claims 17-23 have been added to independent Claim 29. There are now a total of 29 claims, including 3 independent claims. Since there are now 9 claims in excess of 20 a supplemental filing fee is being submitted herewith.

The rejection of Claims 16-20 on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting is noted. Since all of the independent claims, however, are now based upon the subject matter of Claims 25, 26 and 29 which were not included in such double patenting rejection it is respectfully submitted that the double patenting rejection should no longer apply.

In view of the above remarks and amendments this application should be passed to issue.

Dated: October 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Harold Pezzner
Harold Pezzner

Registration No.: 22,112
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant